

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
II. PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND . . . . .	4
III. STANDARD OF REVIEW . . . . .	7
IV. ARGUMENT . . . . .	8
A. Magistrate Judge Kurren Properly Concluded that Plaintiffs Are Not Entitled to Use Pre-Trial Discovery as a Mode for Ascertaining Post-Decision Compliance with the Court’s Interim Injunction. . . .	8
B. Supplementation is Not Likely to Lead to the Discovery of Admissible Evidence Since the Court Issued its Decision on the Scope of Interim Injunction and Closed Discovery. . . . .	11
C. Plaintiffs’ Demand for Advance Notice of Any Training Modifications is Improper and Effectively Imposes the Very Injunction this Court Rejected. . .	13
V. CONCLUSION . . . . .	17